

Appl. No. 10/709,028
Amdt. dated December 30, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 06, 2004

REMARKS

No amendments are made. The claims are listed in the previous section only for the Examiner's convenience.

5

1. Rejection of claims 1, 6-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asprey (US 5,299,306):

The applicant notes that in the text of the rejection the Examiner appears to reference the two peripheral devices 160, 170 inconsistently. For example, lines 5-6 of page 2 of the "Detailed Action" recite "power pins (122 attached to 136 & 138) for connecting to a USC port (126) of a **second peripheral device (170)**". This does not make sense, since for example lines 10-12 of page 2 recite "power pins (122 attached to 136 & 138)...for providing power to **the first peripheral device (160)**," and since Fig.1 of Asprey clearly shows that the line 136 does not connect to the monitor 170. This does not cause significant confusion in understanding the rejection, the applicant simply wants to point out that there appears to be a typographical error(s).

Asprey teaches that power (+5V, GND) and signal (CLK, DTA) are provided to one peripheral device (keyboard) 160, and only signals, i.e. horizontal sync (HOR), vertical sync (VER), video (VID), and intensity (INT), are provided to another peripheral device (monitor) 170.

Claims 1 recites "data connection end...[for] providing communication between the first peripheral device and the computer," the term "communication between" clearly meaning

5

Appl. No. 10/709,028
Amdt. dated December 30, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 06, 2004

two-way data transfer. Claim 9 recites a similar limitation in different terms.

5 However, in Asprey, the only two-way data transfer that is possible is over the lines CLK, DTA. That is, the monitor lines HOR, VER, VID, INT cannot be compared to the data connection end of claim 1 since they are only one-way data lines (computer to monitor). Thus, the applicant contends that given the definition
10 of the data connection end recited in claims 1 and 9, only the keyboard 160 has lines that are comparable. Thus to sustain this rejection, the monitor 170 lines HOR, VER, VID, INT must somehow provide power, which they clearly do not. Accordingly, the applicant contends that this rejection should be withdrawn.

15 Claims 7 and 10 require that both the power connection end/port and the data connection end/port be adapted to provide power. Since the monitor 170 is not connected to the power lines (+5V, GND) of the cable 110 and since the monitor lines HOR, VER,
20 VID, INT are clearly signal lines, Asprey does not teach or suggest providing power to both the keyboard 160 and the monitor 170. Moreover, conventional monitors usually have a completely separate power cable. Thus, claims 7 and 10 should not stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 given this art.

25 Generally power and signal lines can differ in wire gauge, shielding, pairing, and end connection. Simply designating a power line to be a signal line or vice versa does not adequately address these differences and/or resulting problems.

30

Appl. No. 10/709,028
 Amdt. dated December 30, 2004
 Reply to Office action of October 06, 2004

Neglecting the specific devices connected to the ends of the cable or connection module, some key differences between the cited art and claims are summarized in the table below (P = Power, S = Signal, * one-way signal connection).

	Host End	First End	Second End
<u>Asprey</u>	P, S	S*	P, S
Claims 1, 9	P, S	S	P
Claims 7, 10	P, S	P, S	P

Reconsideration of claims 1, 6-11, and 13 is respectfully requested in view of the above arguments. Claims 6-8, 10, 11, and 13 are dependant and should be allowed if the corresponding independent claims are found allowable.

2. Rejection of claims 2-5, 12, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Asprey in view of Applicant's own Admission of Prior Art (AOAPA):

Reconsideration of claims 2-5, 12, and 14-15 is respectfully requested in view of the arguments made for claims 1, 7, 9, and 10 in Item 1 above. Claims 2-5, 12, and 14-15 are dependant and should be allowed if the corresponding independent claims are found allowable.

Appl. No. 10/709,028
Amdt. dated December 30, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 06, 2004

Sincerely yours,

5

Winston Hsu

Date: December 30, 2004

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

10 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

(Please contact me by voice mail if you need a telephone
communication.)

15